

November 8, 2016

CONVERGENCE OF DENSITY EXPANSIONS OF CORRELATION FUNCTIONS AND THE ORNSTEIN-ZERNIKE EQUATION

TOBIAS KUNA AND DIMITRIOS TSAGKAROGIANNIS

ABSTRACT. We prove convergence of the multi-body correlation function as a power series in the density. We work in the context of the cluster expansion in the canonical ensemble and we obtain bounds uniform in the volume and the number of particles. In the thermodynamic limit, the coefficients are characterized by sums over some class of two-connected graphs. We introduce the “direct correlation function” in the canonical ensemble and we prove that in the thermodynamic limit it is given by a convergent power series in the density with coefficients given by sums over some other class of two-connected graphs. Furthermore, it satisfies the Ornstein-Zernike equation from which quantified approximations can be derived.

1. INTRODUCTION

Correlation functions of interacting particle systems provide important information of the macroscopic as well as the microscopic properties of the system. Furthermore, correlation functions of low degree are directly measurable in experiments, in particular the radial distribution function is the main object of interest in the study of liquids and heterogenous materials. This was well captured already in the literature in the 30’s, see [16] and the references therein. Around the same period, with the development of power series expansions by Mayer and his collaborators, [23], a direct perturbative representation of correlation functions in terms of integrals associated to a graphical expansion has been suggested in [24], where the density expansion of the n -body correlation function has been derived. In the 50’s an alternative method appeared, namely the Kirkwood-Salsburg equations for the grand canonical correlation functions, see [17, 12]. For a comparison of the above integral equation approaches, see [39] and the references therein.

However, being perturbative expansions around the ideal gas, the density expansions of the correlation functions are not expected to be valid in the densities of the liquid regime. So, it is desirable to “*develop a theory of classical fluids without using the density expansion formulas*”, [27]. Several suggestions were made and we refer to the description given in [26] and the references therein. Furthermore, Hiroike and Morita suggest that “*.. the theory of classical fluids may be constructed with the knowledge of the pair distribution function alone, even if a form of the pair interaction potential is not known.*” A candidate for deriving such relations is the original Ornstein-Zernike (OZ) equation, [29], which, however, cannot be solved as an equation as it contains two unknown quantities, namely the correlation

Key words and phrases. Correlation function, canonical ensemble, density expansions, direct correlation function, Ornstein-Zernike equation, cluster expansion, liquid theory.

function and the direct correlation function. Hence one has to postulate a relation between them, that is a closure scheme. A lot of effort has been made in this direction and various suggestions have appeared.

In [38], G. Stell relates the most popular closure schemes (such as the Born-Green-Yvon (BGY) hierarchy, [4, 41], the Hyper-Netted Chain (HNC) and the Percus-Yevick (PY) equation [31]) to graphical expansions and tries to motivate them in this way. The approximations are not as simple as restricting to the leading order, quite the contrary as a systematic rule is given on how to select terms from all orders. This requires more elaborated expansion schemes as already suggested by Hiroike and Morita. Shortly after, starting from the grand-canonical ensemble, a wide range of expansions for different thermodynamic quantities have been investigated, see the systematic representation of his and works of others e.g. [26, 9], by G. Stell in his seminal work in [37]. His approach is mainly based on the tools of functional differentiation and proper re-summations of the cluster expansion, or “topological reduction” as he calls it. The first was already used in [1], maybe inspired by the use of generating functionals for the corresponding stochastic processes, which it turns out to be related to thermodynamic quantities. This approach is also closely related with the inverse or realizability problem, where one seeks to find a priori properties of the correlation function, see [19] and the references therein. Furthermore, in [38], Stell suggests that one can construct higher order approximations by including the next terms of these expansions and comments on the feasibility of including these terms. However, it is also acknowledged that *“the manipulations involved in obtaining these infinite sums ... have been carried out in a purely formal way and we have not examined the important but difficult questions of convergence and the legitimacy of the rearrangement of terms”*.

Since then, these points (except the last one) have been well studied and there exists a vast literature at the level of theoretical physics. The last point essentially refers to the analysis of the error terms of the expansion, that is the contribution of the graphs on neglects in the expansion, either because one tries to approximate the correlation functions by a few terms or one tries to use one of the closure schemes. Are these error terms actually of the order the formal expansion suggests? Are the error terms sufficiently decreasing such that the expansion actually converges to the desired quantity? May this analysis explain qualitatively the performance of the closure schemes for the study of the liquid state where one expects that these expansions do not hold? A related intriguing question would be whether some expansions have a better radius of convergence than others.

In the present paper we work on this program by establishing the convergence of the expansion of the n -body correlation function as well as for the direct correlation function in terms of the density. As expected, the convergence is proved deep in the gas phase. Let us also mention that this programme is also very relevant in supporting the quest of defining coarse-grained models for reducing the computational cost in more complex systems. The challenge is to obtain effective theories which perform reasonably well for a wide range of parameters compromising accuracy for efficiency and vice versa. Hence, one can use these expansion techniques in order to represent the coarse-grained potential as a power series of the relevant quantities. Explicit a priori error bounds depending on the parameters of the

problem (e.g. temperature, density) as well as a posteriori ones, expressed in terms of the coarse-grained (computationally “cheap”) quantities, can be derived using these convergence techniques, see e.g. [15] for the case of a lattice-spin model.

The first mathematically rigorous construction of the correlation functions in the thermodynamic limit were obtained in the grand canonical ensemble by [2] in the 40’s. Further progress has been made in the 60’s with the proofs of the convergence of the related cluster expansion of the pressure and the virial expansions of the free energy by Penrose, Lebowitz, Groeneveld and Ruelle based on the so-called tree-graph estimate. For the correlation functions and in the context of the grand canonical ensemble we refer to Ruelle [36] for the validity of the solutions of the equations within the same convergence radius as for the cluster expansions. For the correlation functions in the canonical ensemble we refer to Bogoliubov, Petrina and Hacet [3] who established relations between the distribution functions in a finite volume, which in the limit become the Kirkwood-Salsburg equations. Furthermore, they proved existence and uniqueness of the limiting distribution as well as its analytical dependence on the density. For technical reasons to be explained later, most of the literature was in the context of the grand-canonical ensemble. Even the expansion in terms of the density was derived from the expansion in the grand canonical ensemble instead of the canonical one which would be more natural. After the 70’s, the technique of cluster expansion has been further developed and their validity has been established for a large class of different systems with the introduction of the abstract polymer model. However, for the classical particle model the radius of convergence has not been significantly improved. We refer to [10] for a review of the different sufficient conditions for convergence.

For the case of the classical gas, all results are based on the grand canonical ensemble as the techniques that have been used seem to require that one has to exploit the infinite sum over the number of particles. In [33] the validity of the cluster expansion has been established also in the canonical ensemble in finite and infinite volume, mixing the techniques of abstract polymer model with tree-graph estimates for particle systems. Because of the latter, no significant improvement for the radius of convergence for the virial expansion was achieved. Following this development, in this paper we prove the convergence of the expansions for both the correlation and the direct correlation function by working directly in the more natural canonical ensemble. The radius of convergence appears directly in terms of the density. The main difficulty of the theory is that the n th-term in the expansion is the sum of e^{cn^2} n -dimensional integrals, one for each graph. To show convergence, one has to bound this term by an expression of the order $e^{n \ln n + c'n}$. To achieve that, one has to show that a large group of graphs cancel exactly due to a combinatorial relation exploiting the tree structure. Note that by Riemann’s rearrangement theorem, for any given real number one can find a re-ordering of the summation in the graphs such that the expansion will converge to this number. Hence, following the previously cited comment of Stell, it is a priori far from clear, if a re-summation has any meaning even when it converges.

The structure of this paper is as follows: In Section 2 we present the model and the main results which consist of:

- (1) The convergence in a weak sense of the density expansion of the truncated correlation function.
- (2) The convergence as well as the graphical expansion of the truncated correlation function in the thermodynamic limit.
- (3) The cancelation of terms which lead to a graphical expansion based on some class of two-connected graphs.
- (4) The strong convergence of the truncated correlations as functions uniformly and in L^1 in the variables.
- (5) The convergence of graphical expansion of the direct correlation function in the thermodynamic limit. Furthermore, we show that the direct correlation function solves the OZ equation in the thermodynamic limit.

The corresponding proofs are given in the Sections 3, 4 and 5. Items (1) and (2) are based on the definition of the truncated functions via the generating functional for correlation functions, which allows us to derive the convergence result from the cluster expansion of the abstract polymer model. This is sufficient in order to control the correlation functions in some weak sense. As expected, the range of convergence is strictly inside the gas phase, it is the same for both expansions and it can be improved along the line of [25]. However, it would be desirable to find more accurate estimates which take the two-connected structure appropriately into account. Maybe this could be achieved by a posteriori estimation of the error terms. Item (3) requires a modification of the cancelations derived in [33] taking into account the difference in the combinatorial structure. Another crucial property is the splitting property (4.11) which is based on translation invariance. Even though the correlation functions break the translation invariance of the expansion, the splitting property is preserved. To show item (4), the convergence result for the abstract polymer models had to be re-derived in order to properly take account of the variables. Item (5) requires a re-definition of the activity in the abstract polymer representation as we can show convergence only if one of the two arguments of the direct correlation function is considered in the L^1 norm. The latter modification is essential as only for them the aforementioned splitting property is preserved. Note that expansions based on classes of graphs with higher connectivity properties are harder to treat due to the more rigid combinatorial structure. We conclude with Sections 6 and 7 where we discuss the connections to combinatorial problems and the liquid state theory to be further investigated in future works. In fact, the different expansions in [37] have a strong combinatorial flavour. A common point in this work is that on the one hand the grand-canonical ensemble gives easily convergent expansions for the quantities of interest (correlation functions), but on the other hand, obtaining them as expansions in the density, it requires a further step involving some “inversion” theorem from analytic function theory and a combinatorial relation between graphs, e.g. a “topological reduction” in the language of Stell. In this way, in [20] it was derived the virial expansion from the activity expansion using Lagrange inversion and Mayer’s combinatorial identities [23]. See also [40] and [14] for the multi-species case. In [22] this relation between graphs is put in the systematic context of operations between combinatorial “species”. The point-wise convergence of

the expansion in the argument can also be derived via the grand canonical cluster expansions along the same lines [20]. Using variational inversion formulas, one may also try to show convergence in a uniform sense with respect to the argument. On the other hand, our direct approach has the advantage that it automatically gives the convergence of the correlation function in the canonical ensemble in the thermodynamic limit. The uniform convergence in the argument is a direct consequence of the main estimate. However, the most important point is that the inversion step used by [20] can not be applied to establish the special form of the terms in the expansion of the direct correlation function. This is because there exists no related activity expansion even on a non rigorous level for the direct correlation function. Here, it was crucial to work directly in the canonical ensemble.

2. THE MODEL AND THE RESULTS

We study a system consisting out of N indistinguishable particles described by a configuration $\mathbf{q} := \{q_1, \dots, q_N\}$ (where q_i is the position of the i^{th} particle) confined in a box $\Lambda(\ell) := (-\frac{\ell}{2}, \frac{\ell}{2}]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ (for some $\ell > 0$), which we will also denote for short by Λ when we do not need to explicit the dependence on ℓ . For simplicity, we consider periodic boundary conditions, that is, we identify opposite sides of the square Λ to obtain a torus. The effect of other boundary conditions is left for future studies. The particles interact via a (translation invariant) pair potential $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, which is stable, integrable at infinity and $V(q) = V(-q)$. A potential V is called stable, whenever there exists $B \geq 0$ such that:

$$\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} V(q_i - q_j) \geq -BN, \quad (2.1)$$

for all N and all $q_1, \dots, q_N$. A potential V is called integrable at infinity, whenever

$$C(\beta) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |e^{-\beta V(q)} - 1| dq < \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

The latter condition holds if and only if there exists an $R > 0$ such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R(0)} |V(q)| dq < \infty$. The hard-core potential fulfils all these assumptions and $C(\beta, R) = |B_R(0)|$, the volume of the ball with radius the interaction range R .

The energy of the system H_Λ is defined as

$$H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q}) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} V(q_{i,j}), \quad (2.3)$$

where $q_{i,j}$ denotes among the vectors $q_i - q_j + n\ell$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the one with minimal length. The length of $q_{i,j}$ is equal to the geodesic distance of q_i and q_j on the torus.

2.1. Thermodynamic functions and partition functions. The associated *canonical partition function* of the system described above is given by

$$Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N} := \frac{1}{N!} \int_{\Lambda^N} dq_1 \dots dq_N e^{-\beta H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q})}. \quad (2.4)$$

Given $\rho > 0$, the *density*, we define the *thermodynamic free energy* in the thermodynamic limit by

$$f_\beta(\rho) := \lim_{\substack{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d, N \rightarrow \infty, \\ N = \lfloor \rho |\Lambda| \rfloor}} f_{\beta, \Lambda, N}, \text{ where } f_{\beta, \Lambda, N} := -\frac{1}{\beta |\Lambda|} \log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $|\Lambda|$ is the volume of Λ . The limit exists for suitable sequences of volumes Λ and is actually independent of the boundary condition [11].

The associated *canonical ensemble* in the volume Λ is defined for a measurable set $C \subset \mathbb{R}^{dN}$ by

$$\mu_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(C) := \frac{1}{Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}} \frac{1}{N!} \int_{\Lambda^N \cap C} dq_1 \dots dq_N e^{-\beta H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q})}. \quad (2.6)$$

We introduce some relevant quantities in statistical mechanics to be studied next. Given a test function ϕ we define the Bogoliubov functional $L_B(\phi)$ in the canonical ensemble, in analogy to the definition in the grand-canonical ensemble (by considering the grand-canonical measure restricted to the N -particle sector), see [1], equation (2.11):

$$L_B(\phi) := \int_{\Lambda^N} dq_1 \dots dq_N \prod_{k=1}^N (1 + \phi(q_k)) \mu_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(d\mathbf{q}). \quad (2.7)$$

This is the generating functional of the correlation functions associated to the canonical ensemble. This is justified as the main properties and the relation to the correlation functions extend correctly as explained below. In fact, by expanding the product in (2.7) we obtain

$$L_B(\phi) = \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{1}{n!} \int_{\Lambda^n} \phi(q_1) \dots \phi(q_n) \rho_{\Lambda, N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) dq_1 \dots dq_n, \quad (2.8)$$

where for $n \leq N$ and the points $q_1, \dots, q_n \in \Lambda$ we have defined the *n-point correlation function in the canonical ensemble* $\rho_{\Lambda, N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$ as:

$$\rho_{\Lambda, N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) := \frac{1}{(N-n)!} \int_{\Lambda^{N-n}} dq_{n+1} \dots dq_N \frac{1}{Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}} e^{-\beta H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q})}. \quad (2.9)$$

Note that $\rho_{\Lambda, N}^{(0)} = 1$ and $\rho_{\Lambda, N}^{(1)} = \frac{N}{|\Lambda|}$. Thus, in the thermodynamic limit we obtain $\rho^{(1)} = \rho$. The existence of the thermodynamic limit $\rho^{(n)}$ for $n \geq 2$, that is the limit when $|\Lambda| \uparrow \infty$ with $N = \lfloor \rho |\Lambda| \rfloor$, is more subtle than for thermodynamic quantities like pressure and free energy which are on a logarithmic scale. Analogous results in the grand-canonical ensemble are well-established [35, 36]. Furthermore, for small values of the activity, the correlation functions can be represented as power series in the activity. A by-product of our analysis below is that we also establish the convergence of the thermodynamic limit in the high-temperature-low-density regime. The only related previous result we are aware of is [3].

The logarithm of the Bogoliubov function

$$\log L_B(\phi) =: \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{\Lambda^n} \phi(q_1) \dots \phi(q_n) u_{\Lambda, N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) dq_1 \dots dq_n, \quad (2.10)$$

is the generating function for $u_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$, the sequence of *truncated correlation functions* or *Ursell functions*. Relation (2.10) can be understood as the definition of $u_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$. These are the analogues of the cumulants for the sequence of correlation functions. The correlation functions and the *Ursell functions* can be related directly via a combinatorial formula by comparing (2.8) and (2.10) and give rise to the usual definition of the Ursell functions, see e.g. [35], p.87 or [37], equation (2-8):

$$\rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \sum_{\{P_1, \dots, P_k\} \in \Pi(1, \dots, n)} \prod_{i=1}^k u_{\Lambda,N}^{(|P_i|)}(\underline{q}_{P_i}), \quad (2.11)$$

where $\Pi(1, \dots, n)$ is the set of all partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For $P_i = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, we use the shortcut notation: $\underline{q}_{P_i} = q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_k}$. For example, for $n = 2$ we have:

$$u_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) = \rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) - \rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(1)}(q_1)\rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(1)}(q_2).$$

We will see that in the thermodynamic limit the functions of ρ , $\rho^{(n)}$ and $u^{(n)}$ (the limits of $\rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}$ and $u_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}$) have as leading order ρ^n . Hence, it is common to introduce the following order one functions:

$$g_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) := \frac{\rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)}{\rho^n} \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) := \frac{u_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)}{\rho^n}. \quad (2.13)$$

Due to the periodic boundary conditions all correlation functions introduced above will be translation invariant. Furthermore, as all bounds will be uniform in Λ and N , it follows that all relations described in this subsection will still hold true in the thermodynamic limit.

Finally, we concentrate on the case $n = 2$. We express all correlation functions as functions of the difference of coordinates $\rho_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2)$, $u_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2)$, $g_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2)$. The latter is known as the *radial distribution function* (in case that the potential V is also radial symmetric) and $h_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2)$ as the *structure function*. Then the following relation holds

$$h_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2) = g_{\Lambda,N}^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2) - \left(\frac{N}{\rho|\Lambda|} \right)^2, \quad (2.14)$$

which in the thermodynamic limit simplifies to

$$h^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2) = g^{(2)}(q_1 - q_2) - 1. \quad (2.15)$$

Another type of correlation function playing a central role in the theory of liquids is the *Ornstein - Zernike direct correlation function* $c(q_1, q_2)$. In the thermodynamic limit it is defined via the following relation, the *Ornstein-Zernike equation*:

$$h^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) = c(q_1, q_2) + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} c(q_1, q_3) h^{(2)}(q_3, q_2) \rho^{(1)}(q_3) dq_3. \quad (2.16)$$

The direct correlation function is the building block of the classical theory of fluids, see e.g. [38] and the references therein. To the best of our knowledge, in the literature there was no rigorous proof (for the generic continuous model we are considering here) of the existence of the direct correlation function satisfying (2.16), which is the content of Theorem 2.9 below. For the finite range Ising model above the critical temperature we refer to [7], while recently it has been also investigated for the random connection model of percolation [21] in the context of point processes.

In contrast to the grand-canonical ensemble where the activity appears as a parameter in the definition, in the canonical ensemble the density only enters as a parameter in the thermodynamic limit. In finite volume, the right approximation to the density is given by the following (or similar) expression for $n \leq N$:

$$P_{N,|\Lambda|}(n) := \frac{N(N-1) \cdots (N-n+1)}{|\Lambda|^n}, \quad \text{for } n \leq N, \quad (2.17)$$

which tends to ρ^n in the thermodynamic limit. For $n > N$ we put $P_{N,|\Lambda|}(n) = 0$. For the convenience of the reader, the first result is stated without any reference to the polymer expansion to be considered next. It expresses the correlation functions in terms of these approximated powers of the density and establishes that it converges to a power series expansion in ρ in the thermodynamic limit.

Theorem 2.1. *There exists a constant $c_0 := c_0(\beta, B) > 0$, independent of N and Λ such that if $\rho C(\beta) < c_0$ (with $N = \lfloor \rho |\Lambda| \rfloor$), for a test function ϕ we obtain:*

$$\int_{\Lambda^n} \phi(q_1) \cdots \phi(q_n) u_{\Lambda, N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) dq_1 \cdots dq_n = \sum_{k \geq 0} F_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(n, k), \quad (2.18)$$

where

$$F_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(n, k) = \sum_{m=1}^n P_{N, |\Lambda|}(m+k) B_{\beta, \Lambda}(n, m, k), \quad (2.19)$$

with $P_{N, |\Lambda|}(m+k)$ defined as in (2.17) and $B_{\beta, \Lambda}(n, m, k)$ defined as in (3.13), after introducing the abstract polymer model. Furthermore, there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that, for every N and Λ , the coefficients $F_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(n, k)$, $n \geq 1$, satisfy

$$|F_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(n, k)| \leq C e^{-ck}. \quad (2.20)$$

For $\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $N = \lfloor \rho |\Lambda| \rfloor$ the coefficient $B_{\beta, \Lambda}(n, m, k)$ converges to a limit $\bar{B}_\beta(n, k)$ which is determined in (4.15) and the series

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{dn}} \phi(q_1) \cdots \phi(q_n) u^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) dq_1 \cdots dq_n = \rho^n \sum_{k \geq 0} \rho^k \bar{B}_\beta(n, k) \quad (2.21)$$

is absolutely convergent.

Remark 2.2. *To prove Theorem 2.1 we follow the strategy presented in [33]. As a result, the radius of convergence or the value of c_0 is the same as in [33]. However, one can easily*

obtain slightly better values by following the machinery developed in [10] and applied in the case of the canonical ensemble in [25].

For convenience we will work with $h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}$ (which asymptotically coincides with $u_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}$ up to a power of ρ). The next step is to identify in $h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}$ the leading order terms that survive in the thermodynamic limit and show that it converges to a function $h^{(n)}$ which is analytic in ρ . In $q_1, \dots, q_n$ the limit is uniform. Up to translation invariance the limit holds also in L^1 . In order to obtain an explicit description of the limiting $h^{(n)}$, we need an explicit asymptotic expression for $B_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k)$ in terms of a graphical representation. The resulting expression for $h^{(n)}$ was already suggested in [24], [26] and [37], but the question of convergence of the power series remained open since then and we address it here. First, we introduce some concepts from combinatorics and graph theory. We also denote by $f_{i,j} := e^{-\beta V(q_i - q_j)} - 1$ Mayer's f -function. Partially following [22] we define:

Definition 2.3. A (simple) graph is a pair $g := (V(g), E(g))$, where $V(g)$ is the set of vertices and $E(g)$ is the set of edges, with $E(g) \subset \{U \subset V(g) : |U| = 2\}$, $|\cdot|$ denoting the cardinality of a set. A graph $g = (V(g), E(g))$ is said to be connected, if for every pair $A, B \subset V(g)$ such that $A \cup B = V(g)$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$, there is an edge $e \in E(g)$ such that $e \cap A \neq \emptyset$ and $e \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Singletons are considered to be connected. We use $\mathcal{C}_V$ to denote the set of connected graphs on the set of vertices $V \subset [N]$, where we use the notation $[N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$.

Definition 2.4. A cutpoint of a connected graph g is a vertex of g whose removal (with the attached edges) yields a disconnected graph. A connected graph is called 2-connected if it has no cutpoint. A block in a simple graph is a maximal 2-connected subgraph. The block-graph of a graph g is a new graph whose vertices are the blocks of g and whose edges correspond to a pair of blocks having a common cutpoint.

Cutpoints are frequently also called articulation points. In this article, we reserve the latter notion for the following slightly more general concept. We use this terminology in order to stay close to Stell's seminal presentation [37] of these graphical constructions.

Definition 2.5. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We consider graphs with $n + k$ vertices, of which the first n vertices are singled out and for simplicity we call them "white". All other vertices are considered to be "black". The set of all such graphs is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_{n,n+k}$. Single vertices are not considered as graphs. Similarly, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_{n,n+k}$ the set of all connected graphs on $n + k$ vertices with n white vertices.

A vertex is called articulation vertex if upon its removal the component of which it is part separates into two or more connected pieces in such a way that at least one piece contains no white vertices.

We denote by $\mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}_{n,n+k}$ free of articulation vertices.

The easiest example to distinguish cutpoint from articulation point is the graph: 1 (white) - 2 (black) - 3 (white), which is an articulation free graph, but it is not a 2-connected one, as the vertex 2 is a cutpoint (but not an articulation point).

This concept of articulation vertices free graph is also crucial for the definition of the so-called direct correlation function, see below in (2.29) and (2.30). Motivated by the distinction between an articulation point and a cutpoint, we introduce the concept of a *nodal* point.

Definition 2.6. *A vertex is a nodal vertex if there exists two white vertices in its connected component, which are different from the first vertex, such that all the paths between that pair of chosen white vertices passes through the first vertex.*

We denote by $\mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}$ the set of all connected graphs over n white and k black vertices free of articulation and of nodal vertices. The latter coincides with the collection of all two-connected graphs on $n+k$ vertices with n white vertices.

The nodal points are exactly the cutpoints of a graph that are not articulation points. For a graph $g \in \mathcal{G}_{n,n+k}$ we define the activity

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, \{1, \dots, n\}) := \int \prod_{i=1}^{n+k} \frac{dq_i}{|\Lambda|} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \prod_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \phi(q_i), \quad (2.22)$$

as well as its version without the test function ϕ , but with dependence on a fixed configuration $q_1, \dots, q_n$:

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, \dots, q_n) := \int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=n+1}^{k+n} dq_j \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j}, \quad (2.23)$$

where $f_{i,j} := e^{-\beta V(q_i - q_j)} - 1$. If ϕ is compactly supported, then $\tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}$ scales as $|\Lambda|^{1-n-k}$ while $\tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}$ is of order one. Note also that in this paper we tend to denote with a $\bullet$ all quantities that depend on the position of some particles $q_1, \dots, q_n$.

Theorem 2.7. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, we can write:*

$$B_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k) = \bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) \delta_{n,m} + R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k),$$

where $\bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k)$ is of leading order, that is, the leading order is achieved for $m = n$:

$$\bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) = \frac{|\Lambda|^{n+k}}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, \{1, \dots, n\}) \quad (2.24)$$

and

$$|R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k)| \leq \frac{C}{|\Lambda|}, \quad (2.25)$$

for all n, k and uniformly on ϕ (the dependence on ϕ is through (2.22)). Furthermore, the thermodynamic limit exists and it is given by the following absolutely convergent series in powers of ρ , for all $\rho C(\beta) < c_0$ (for the same c_0 as in Theorem 2.1):

$$h^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) := \lim_{\substack{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d, N \rightarrow \infty, \\ N = \lfloor \rho |\Lambda| \rfloor}} h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \rho^k \frac{1}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, \dots, q_n), \quad (2.26)$$

where

$$\tilde{\zeta}^\bullet(g; q_1, \dots, q_n) := \lim_{\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1, \dots, q_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dk}} \prod_{j=n+1}^{n+k} dq_j \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j}. \quad (2.27)$$

Moreover, at infinite volume, we have the following bound:

$$\sup_{q_1, \dots, q_n \in \Lambda^n} |h^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)| \leq C. \quad (2.28)$$

Remark 2.8. Equation (2.26) is the representation given in formula 5-5 in [37]. The author derived this expression from a formal re-summing of the grand canonical ensemble power series representation in the activity. Here the formula is derived directly in the canonical ensemble. In Stell's words, " $h^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$ is the sum of all distinct connected simple graphs consisting of white 1-circles labeled by $1, 2, \dots, n$, respectively, some or no black ρ_1 -circles, and at least one f -bond, such that the graphs are free of articulation circles, i.e., are 1-irreducible". Note the definition of an articulation point from Stell.

For the particular case of two fixed white vertices, recalling the definition of a nodal point and of the set $\mathcal{B}_{2,n+2}$ we define the *direct correlation function* in the canonical ensemble, i.e., for fixed volume Λ and number of particles $N+2$:

$$c_{\Lambda, N+2}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) := \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\rho^n}{n!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2,n+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1, q_2). \quad (2.29)$$

Then we have the following theorem:

Theorem 2.9. Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 the direct correlation function in (2.29) fulfils the Ornstein-Zernike equation (2.16) up to the order $O(1/|\Lambda|)$. In the thermodynamic limit, $c_{\Lambda, N+2}^{(2)}$ converges to

$$c^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\rho^n}{n!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2,n+2}} \tilde{\zeta}^\bullet(g; q_1, q_2), \quad (2.30)$$

which is an analytic function in ρ , for $\rho C(\beta) < c_0$. Furthermore, the series (2.30) converges in the following sense:

$$\sup_{q_1 \in \Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \frac{\rho^n}{n!} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2,n+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1, q_2) \right| \leq C e^{-cn}, \quad (2.31)$$

uniformly in Λ and N and the limit function fulfils the Ornstein-Zernike equation (2.16).

Remark 2.10. As a direct consequence of (2.31) we have that

$$\sup_{q_1 \in \Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 |c_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2)| < \infty \quad (2.32)$$

which together with (2.28) (for $n = 2$), they prove that the Ornstein-Zernike equation (2.16) is well defined.

3. CLUSTER EXPANSION, PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1.

Using the relation between the logarithm of the Bogoliubov function and the truncated correlation functions (Ursell functions), cf. (2.10), we can express the truncated correlation functions as variational derivatives of the logarithm of an extended partition function:

$$\int \phi(q_1) \dots \phi(q_n) u^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) dq_1 \dots dq_n = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \alpha^n} \log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(\alpha \phi)|_{\alpha=0}, \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(\alpha \phi) := \frac{1}{N!} \int \prod_{i=1}^N (1 + \alpha \phi(q_i)) e^{-\beta H_{\Lambda}(q)} dq_1 \dots dq_N. \quad (3.2)$$

This follows from the fact that

$$L_B(\alpha \phi) = \frac{Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(\alpha \phi)}{Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(0)}, \quad Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(0) \equiv Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}.$$

We define the space $\mathcal{V}_N^*$ whose elements are all ordered pairs (V, A) where $V \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $A \subset V$. We say that two elements (V_1, A_1) and (V_2, A_2) are compatible, and denote it by $(V_1, A_1) \sim (V_2, A_2)$, if and only if $V_1 \sim V_2$, where two sets V_1, V_2 are called *compatible* (denoted by $V_1 \sim V_2$) if $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$; otherwise we call them *incompatible* ($\not\sim$).

Then we split (3.2) as

$$Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}(\alpha \phi) = \frac{|\Lambda|^N}{N!} Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(\alpha \phi) \quad (3.3)$$

and write

$$Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(\alpha \phi) = \sum_{\{(V_1, A_1), \dots, (V_k, A_k)\} \sim} \prod_{i=1}^k \zeta_{\Lambda}((V_i, A_i)), \quad (3.4)$$

where

$$\zeta_{\Lambda}((V, A)) := \alpha^{|A|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, A), \quad \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, A) := \int \frac{d\underline{q}_V}{|\Lambda|^{|V|}} \prod_{\{i, j\} \in E(g)} f_{i, j} \prod_{i \in A} \phi(q_i), \quad (3.5)$$

with the latter as already defined in (2.22), and $d\underline{q}_V$ is a shorthand for the product measure $\prod_{i \in V} dq_i$. Hence, we are in the framework of the so-called *Abstract Polymer Model* which consists of (i) a set of polymers $\mathcal{V}_N^*$, (ii) a binary symmetric relation $\sim$ of compatibility between the polymers (i.e., on $\mathcal{V}_N^* \times \mathcal{V}_N^*$) and (iii) a weight function $\zeta_{\Lambda} : \mathcal{V}_N^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We also define the compatibility graph $\mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{V}_N^*}$ to be the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{V}_N^*$ and with an edge between two polymers (V_i, A_i) and (V_j, A_j) if and only if they are an incompatible pair. In this framework we have the following formal relation for the logarithm, which will be justified rigorously in Theorem 3.1 below (see [18], [5] and [28]):

$$\log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(\alpha \phi) = \log \left(\sum_{\{(V_1, A_1), \dots, (V_k, A_k)\} \sim} \prod_{i=1}^k \zeta_{\Lambda}((V_i, A_i)) \right) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_N^*)} c_I \zeta_{\Lambda}^I, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$c_I = \frac{1}{I!} \sum_{G \subset \mathcal{G}_I} (-1)^{|E(G)|}. \quad (3.7)$$

The sum in (3.6) is over the set $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_N^*)$ of all multi-indices $I : \mathcal{V}_N^* \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots\}$. We use the shortcut $\zeta_\Lambda^I := \prod_{(V,A)} \zeta_\Lambda((V,A))^{I((V,A))}$, but for notational simplicity in stating the main theorem of cluster expansion, we use the notation $\gamma := (V,A)$ for the generic polymer consisting of the ordered pair $(V,A) \in \mathcal{V}_N^*$. Then we denote $\text{supp } I := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{V}_N^* : I(\gamma) > 0\}$, $\mathcal{G}_I$ is the graph with $\sum_{\gamma \in \text{supp } I} I(\gamma)$ vertices induced from $\mathcal{G}_{\text{supp } I} \subset \mathbb{G}_{\mathcal{V}_N^*}$ by replacing each vertex γ by the complete graph on $I(\gamma)$ vertices. Furthermore, the sum in (3.7) is over all connected subgraphs G of $\mathcal{G}_I$ spanning the whole set of vertices of $\mathcal{G}_I$ and $I! := \prod_{\gamma \in \text{supp } I} I(\gamma)!$. Note that if I is such that $\mathcal{G}_{\text{supp } I}$ is not connected (i.e., I is not a cluster) then $c_I = 0$. We state the general theorem as a slightly simplified version of [5] and [28], to where we refer the reader for the proof.

Theorem 3.1 (Cluster Expansion). *Assume that there are two non-negative functions $a, c : \mathcal{V}_N^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{V}_N^*$, $|\zeta_\Lambda(\gamma)|e^{a(\gamma)+c(\gamma)} \leq \delta$ holds, for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Moreover, assume that for each polymer γ'*

$$\sum_{\gamma \sim \gamma'} |\zeta_\Lambda(\gamma)|e^{a(\gamma)+c(\gamma)} \leq a(\gamma'). \quad (3.8)$$

Then, for every polymer $\gamma' \in \mathcal{V}_N^*$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{I: I(\gamma') \geq 1} |c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I| e^{\sum_{\gamma \in \text{supp } I} I(\gamma)c(\gamma)} \leq |\zeta_\Lambda(\gamma')|e^{a(\gamma')+c(\gamma')}, \quad (3.9)$$

where the coefficients c_I are given in (3.7).

Proof of Theorem 2.1: From (3.1), (3.2) and by representing the partition function by the Abstract Polymer Model, we first check the validity of the convergence condition (3.8) of Theorem 3.1. Using again the notation (V,A) (instead of γ), in order to bound the activity $\zeta_\Lambda((V,A))$ we use the tree-graph inequality (see the original references [30], [6]; here we use the particular form given in [32], Proposition 6.1 (a)):

$$\left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_n} \prod_{\{j,k\} \in E(g)} f_{j,k} \right| \leq e^{2\beta Bn} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_n} \prod_{\{j,k\} \in E(T)} |f_{j,k}|, \quad (3.10)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_n$ and $\mathcal{C}_n$ are respectively the set of trees and connected graphs with n vertices. We obtain that

$$\sum_{(V,A): V \geq 1} |\zeta_\Lambda((V,A))| e^{c|V|} \leq$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{(V,A): V \ni 1} \alpha^{|A|} \|\phi\|_\infty^{|A|} e^{(2\beta B+c)|V|} |\mathcal{T}_{|V|}| \frac{|\Lambda|}{|\Lambda|^{|V|}} C(\beta)^{|V|-1} \\
&\leq e^{(2\beta B+c)} \sum_{n \geq 2} \binom{N-1}{n-1} \frac{n^{n-2}}{|\Lambda|^{n-1}} e^{(2\beta B+c)(n-1)} C(\beta)^{n-1} \sum_{A: |A| \leq n} (\alpha \|\phi\|_\infty)^{|A|} \\
&\leq (1 + \alpha \|\phi\|_\infty) e^{(2\beta B+c)} \sum_{n \geq 2} \left((1 + \alpha \|\phi\|_\infty) e^{(2\beta B+c)} \frac{N}{|\Lambda|} C(\beta) \right)^{n-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have also bounded the finite volume integrals $\int_\Lambda |f_{j,k}| dq_k$ by $C(\beta)$, given in (2.2). Hence, for any value of α , by bounding $\frac{N}{|\Lambda|} \leq \rho$ and choosing $\rho C(\beta)$ small enough, the right hand side is finite being a convergent geometric series; hence (3.8) holds. Then, applying Theorem 3.1, the logarithm of the partition function is an absolutely convergent series (3.6) which we analyse next. Let

$$n := \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} |A| I((V,A)) \quad \text{and} \quad m := \left| \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} A \right|. \quad (3.11)$$

Note that m is the number of white vertices and n the number of white vertices counted with their multiplicity, that is the number of times a particular vertex appears in different polymers. Moreover, let k be the number of the remaining vertices, i.e., all vertices which are in the V 's, but not in any of the A 's, that is, $\cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} V = [m+k]$. As $|V| \geq 2$, then, if $A = \emptyset$ for all A , we should have that $2 \leq k \leq N$. Otherwise, if $m = 1$ then $k \geq 1$, while for our case of $n \geq 2$, we have that $k \geq 0$ as below. Recall that $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(\alpha \phi) &= \log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(0) + \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{N-m} \binom{N}{m+k} \binom{m+k}{m} \alpha^n \sum_{\substack{I: \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} A = [m] \\ \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} V = [m+k] \\ \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} |A| I((V,A)) = n}} c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I \\
&= \log Z_{\beta, \Lambda, N}^{\text{int}}(0) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{k=0}^{N-m} \alpha^n P_{N, |\Lambda|}(m+k) B_{\beta, \Lambda}(n, m, k), \quad (3.12)
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{N, |\Lambda|}$ is given in (2.17) and

$$B_{\beta, \Lambda}(n, m, k) := \frac{|\Lambda|^{(m+k)}}{m!k!} \sum_{\substack{I: \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} A = [m] \\ \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} V = [m+k] \\ \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} |A| I((V,A)) = n}} c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I. \quad (3.13)$$

Hence, from (3.1) taking the n -th order derivative in (3.12) and evaluating at $\alpha = 0$, obtaining another absolutely convergent series, formula (2.18) is proved with $F_{\beta, \Lambda, N}$ as in (2.19).

Furthermore, from (3.12) and (3.9) the bound (2.20) follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_{\beta,\Lambda,N}(n,k)| &\leq e^{-ck} \sum_{m=1}^n \sum_{\substack{I: \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} A = [m] \\ \cup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} V = [m+k] \\ \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} |A| I((V,A)) = n}} |c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I| e^{ck} \\
&\leq e^{-ck} \sum_{(V',A'): A' \ni \{1\}} \sum_{\substack{I: \\ I((V',A')) \geq 1}} |c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I| e^{c \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I} I((V,A)) |V|} \\
&\leq e^{-ck} \sum_{(V',A'): A' \ni \{1\}} |\zeta_\Lambda((V',A'))| e^{(a+c)|V'|} \leq nC e^{-ck}, \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C > 0$, uniformly in N, n, k and Λ .

Lastly, the proof of (2.21) will be given in the next section and in particular in (4.15). $\square$

4. LEADING ORDER TERMS, PROOF OF THEOREM 2.7

Given (3.13) we first identify the terms that will survive in the thermodynamic limit. We claim that in the thermodynamic limit a summand in (3.13) is non-zero only if for all the polymers (V, A) in $\text{supp } I$, only for exactly one $A \neq \emptyset$. Indeed, polymers (V, A) with $A \neq \emptyset$ have activities $\zeta_\Lambda((V_i, A_i))$, $i = 1, 2$, which are of order $O(1/|\Lambda|^{|V_i|})$, whereas, polymers of the type $(V, \emptyset)$ have associated activities $\zeta_\Lambda((V, \emptyset))$ of order $O(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|V|-1}})$. As each polymer has at least one vertex in common with some other polymer, this implies the claim by power counting. In order to be more concrete, let us consider the following case: suppose the contrary is true and let (V_1, A_1) and (V_2, A_2) be two polymers with both $A_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $A_2 \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, the two polymers are connected with each other either directly (sharing a label) or via other polymers of the type $(V, \emptyset)$. If $V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$ then B_Λ (given in (3.13)) is of order $O(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|})$. The same is true if they are connected via other polymers of the type $(V, \emptyset)$. In order to show it, let us assume (without loss of generality) that there is only one such connecting polymer. As for the latter the activity is $\zeta_\Lambda((V, \emptyset)) = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|V|-1}}$, we obtain that, again, the corresponding term in $B_{\beta,\Lambda}$ is of the order of:

$$|\Lambda|^{|V_1|+|V_2|+|V|-2} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|V_1|}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|V_2|}} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|V|-1}} = \frac{1}{|\Lambda|}.$$

Hence, the structure of the leading term at the level of the multi-indices is quite simple: only one polymer, call it (V_0, A_0) has $A_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then, for all other polymers with $A = \emptyset$ we can have a further structure as explained below (and as in [33]). Since it is always true that the total number of labels $(m+k)$ should satisfy $m+k \leq \sum_{V \in \text{supp } I} (|V|-1) + 1$ (due to the fact that each (V, A) should be incompatible with at least one of the other polymers, i.e.,

have at least one common label and $V_0 \cup \bigcup_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I, V \neq V_0} V = [m+k]$, overall we have:

$$I((V, A)) = 1, \forall (V, A) \in \text{supp } I, \text{ and} \quad (4.1)$$

$$m+k = |V_0| + \sum_{(V,A) \in \text{supp } I, V \neq V_0} (|V| - 1). \quad (4.2)$$

Hence, we restrict the summation over multi-indices in this subclass satisfying properties (4.1), (4.2) and containing only one polymer (V_0, A_0) with $A_0 \neq \emptyset$. We denote this fact by adding a superscript $*$ at the sum as e.g. in (4.4) below. These polymers $(V, \emptyset)$ can be attached to the polymer with $A \neq \emptyset$ either on a vertex not in A (a black circle in the terminology of Stell) or in a vertex in A (a white circle in the terminology of Stell). In order to visualize the last case, we give the following example: consider the following multi-index I : I is equal to one on the two polymers $(\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\})$ and $(\{1, 3\}, \emptyset)$, zero otherwise. The two polymers intersect in the label 1. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda|^3 \zeta_\Lambda^I &= |\Lambda|^3 \alpha^2 \int \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) f_{1,2}(q_1 - q_2) \frac{dq_1}{|\Lambda|} \frac{dq_2}{|\Lambda|} \cdot \int f_{1,3}(q_1 - q_3) \frac{dq_1}{|\Lambda|} \frac{dq_3}{|\Lambda|} \\ &= \alpha^2 \int \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) f_{1,2}(q_1 - q_2) dq_1 dq_2 \cdot \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \int f_{1,3}(q_1 - q_3) dq_1 dq_3. \\ &= \alpha^2 \int \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) f_{1,2}(q_1 - q_2) dq_1 dq_2 \cdot \int f_{1,3}(q_3) dq_3. \end{aligned}$$

As we will explain later, this term will be canceled by one summand from the term $|\Lambda|^3 \zeta_\Lambda^{I'}$, with I' being the multi-index which is one only on the polymer $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2\})$ and in particular with the summand in $|\Lambda|^3 \zeta_\Lambda^{I'}$ which is associated with the graph on $\{1, 2, 3\}$ with exactly two edges $\{3, 1\}$ and $\{1, 2\}$. Let us start with the formal proof for these cancelations.

Proof of Theorem 2.7: Following the discussion above, we split $B_{\beta,\Lambda}$ from (3.13) as follows:

$$B_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k) = \bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) \delta_{n,m} + R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k), \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) := \frac{|\Lambda|^{(n+k)}}{n!k!} \sum_{I: A(I)=[n+k]}^* c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I \quad (4.4)$$

and

$$A(I) := \bigcup_{V \in \text{supp } I} V. \quad (4.5)$$

Recall that the superscript $*$ indicates that the sum is over all multi-indices that satisfy properties (4.1), (4.2) and that contain only one polymer with $A \neq \emptyset$, for which we have already chosen its labels and it is $A_0 := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For this reason, we can now consider multi-indices in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k})$, where the class $\mathcal{V}_{n,k}$ consists of all subsets of the labels corresponding to the white vertices $\{1, \dots, n\}$ and the black vertices $\{n+1, \dots, n+k\}$. The new polymers either they contain A_0 or they intersect it at at most one point. Therefore, in the new set-up

with $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k})$ the conditions (4.1) and (4.2) are given by

$$I(V) = 1, \forall V \in \text{supp } I, \text{ and} \quad (4.6)$$

$$m + k = |V_0| + \sum_{V \in \text{supp } I, V \neq V_0} (|V| - 1), \quad (4.7)$$

where $V_0 \supset A_0$ and we still refer to them by a $*$ over the sum. Moreover, $R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k)$ consists of lower order terms $1/|\Lambda|$. The proof that also their sum is of order $1/|\Lambda|$ is a bit more delicate, but has been done in [34], Lemma 6.1 and 6.2 to which we refer for the details. The next step is to investigate cancellations that take place in finite volume. These originate from the fact that a given structure (graph) might appear in several multi-indices multiplied with different combinatorial coefficients and as a result they cancel with each other exactly. To implement this step, we fix a graph and we sum over all multi-indices that can produce it (also compatible with the previous restriction, in particular that all white vertices have to be in one polymer) and apply Corollary 1 in [33]. However, this corollary can only be applied directly for the case of only “black” vertices. For example, the graph 1 (white) - 2 (black) - 3 (white) is not canceled. The vertex 2, even though it is a cutpoint, it is not an articulation point as it is linked to only “white” vertices. Indeed, in this case we do not have cancellation as the vertices 1 and 3 are white and hence the only combination of polymers in the sum (4.4) which contains this graph is $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2\})$ as all white have to be in only one polymer. This is one example of a graph that survives the cancelation.

In the next lemma we give a substantial account of these cancelations and show that (4.4) can be expressed as in [37].

Lemma 4.1. *For all $n \geq 2, k \geq 1$ and Λ large enough, (4.4) is equal to*

$$\bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) = \frac{|\Lambda|^{n+k}}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, \{1, \dots, n\}),$$

as it has been announced in (2.24).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. We rearrange the sum in (4.4) by first fixing a graph $g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k}$ and then summing over all multi-indices in the new space $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k})$ that can produce such a graph. We use the shortcut $I \sim g$ for the class $I : \text{supp } I \subset \mathcal{A}(g)$ with $A(I) = V(g)$, $|V \cap V'| = 1, \forall V, V' \in \text{supp } I$ and each edge of g is contained in some polymer V with $I(V) > 0$. We have:

$$\bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) = \frac{|\Lambda|^{n+k}}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}(g, \{1, \dots, n\}) \sum_{I \sim g}^* c_I, \quad (4.8)$$

where we recall that the sum $*$ is over all multi-indices that satisfy (4.6), (4.7) and that contain only one polymer with $V \supset A_0$, $A_0 = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Note that this sum is finite. Then, in order to obtain (2.24), we show that the sum of multi-indices $\sum_{I \sim g}^* c_I$ is one if $g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}$ and zero otherwise, as it will be proved in (4.12).

To do that, we follow the corresponding proof in [33]. We give here the necessary modifications. For a fixed graph $g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k}$, let $V(g)$ be its set of labels and consider the sum $\sum_{I: A(I) \subset V(g)}^* c_I \zeta^I$. Moreover, in our case, in this sum the multi-indices are supported on a collection of polymers with only one with nonempty A . Given g , we identify the articulation points and define the set of graphs $\mathbb{B}(g) := \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_r\}$ where the b_i 's are the components free of articulation vertices. Notice that one of them, b_0 (without loss of generality), contains all white vertices with labels in A_0 .

We denote by $\mathcal{F}_\infty(g)$ the collection of all $F \subset \mathbb{B}(g)$ such that $\cup_{b \in F} b$ is a connected graph, where we use the notation $\cup_{b \in F} b := (\cup_{b \in F} V(b), \cup_{b \in F} E(b))$ for the union of graphs. We also define $\mathcal{H}(g)$ to be the collection of all such graphs:

$$\mathcal{H}(g) := \{g' : g' = \bigcup_{b \in F} b, F \in \mathcal{F}_\infty(g)\}. \quad (4.9)$$

Similarly,

$$\mathcal{A}(g) := \{V(g'), g' \in \mathcal{H}(g)\} \quad (4.10)$$

is the collection of the corresponding subsets of the set of labels. The key property for the cancellations is the fact that for any $g' \in \mathcal{H}(g)$, with $g' = \bigcup_{b \in F} b$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}_\infty(g)$, the following *factorization* holds

$$\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g') = \prod_{b \in F} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(b), \quad (4.11)$$

for all finite Λ . We have used the following notation: $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g) := \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g, A_0)$, if $V(g) \supset A_0$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g) := \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g, \emptyset)$ otherwise. The relation (4.11) is due to the fact that the intersection points of the articulation vertex free components b in g' are articulation points (for g') and that for the integration in $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda$ we assume periodic boundary conditions. Moreover, all white vertices are contained in b_0 . Notice that if we had white vertices in different components, then (4.11) would not be true. Then the main result in [33], Lemma 2 still holds true:

Lemma 4.2. *For any $V^* \in \mathcal{V}_{n,k}$ and any $g \in \mathcal{C}_{V^*}$, let $\mathbb{B}(g) = \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ be the set of its articulation vertex free components. Thus there exists $\ell_0 > 0$ such that for all $\ell > \ell_0$ the coefficient multiplying the monomials $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(b_0)^{n_0}, \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(b_1)^{n_1}, \dots, \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(b_k)^{n_k}$ (where $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda(\ell)$), for any $n_i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, k$, in the series $\sum_{I: A(I) \subset V^*} c_I \zeta_\Lambda^I$ with $\zeta_\Lambda(V) = \sum_{g' \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda(g')$, is equal to zero except when $k = 0$, i.e., when g is itself an articulation vertex free graph.*

The only modification in the proof with respect to [33] is when we check the convergence of the new cluster expansion, in equation (47). The presence of the white vertices makes it even easier since we win a power of $|\Lambda|$ because of non translation invariance, therefore we refrain from repeating the proof here and we refer the reader to [33].

Thus, since we know that in (4.8) the component b_0 has to appear in each summand and since by Lemma 4.2 there should be only one component, then the only non-zero contribution comes from the articulation vertex free component, i.e., $g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{\text{AF}}$. In other words, we have

that for every $g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k} \cap (\mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{\text{AF}})^c$,

$$\sum_{\substack{I: \text{supp } I \subset \mathcal{A}(g), A(I)=V^* \\ |V \cap V'|=1, \forall V, V' \in \text{supp } I}} c_I = 0 \quad (4.12)$$

and $= 1$, otherwise. Notice the difference with respect to [33]: here, the element $b_0 \in \mathbb{B}(g)$ as it appears in $\mathcal{A}(g)$ (via $\mathcal{H}(g)$, defined above) is special and consists of articulation free graphs in their new definition within the presence of “white” vertices. This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. $\square$

The next challenge is to extract bounds on the quantity $h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$. To do this, we need to interchange the integrals over $q_1, \dots, q_n$ with the sum over k in the thermodynamic limit, hence we need to prove convergence of the cluster expansion with activities being functions of $q_1, \dots, q_n$ in an appropriate norm. From (2.19) using the splitting (4.3) we have:

$$F_{\beta,\Lambda,N}(n, k) = P_{N,|\Lambda|}(n+k) \bar{B}_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, k) + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(m+k) R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k), \quad (4.13)$$

where the second term is vanishing in the limit $\Lambda \uparrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Substituting in (2.18) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda^n} \prod_{i=1}^n (dq_i \phi(q_i)) \rho^n h_{\Lambda,N}^{(n)}(q_1, \dots, q_n) = \\ & \sum_{k \geq 0} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(n+k) \frac{1}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{\text{AF}}} \int_{\Lambda^{n+k}} \prod_{j=1}^{n+k} dq_j \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \prod_{i=1}^n \phi(q_i) \\ & + \sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(m+k) R_{\beta,\Lambda}(n, m, k). \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Then, having the bounds (2.20) and (2.25) we can take the thermodynamic limit on the right hand side of (4.14) and obtain:

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} \rho^n \rho^k \bar{B}_{\beta}(n, k), \quad \bar{B}_{\beta}(n, k) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dn}} \prod_{i=1}^n (dq_i \phi(q_i)) \frac{1}{n!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{\text{AF}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{dk}} \prod_{i=1}^k dq_{n+i} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j}, \quad (4.15)$$

which implies (2.21) in Theorem 2.1 and gives an explicit formula for $\bar{B}_{\beta}(n, k)$. In order to obtain (2.26) we need to go one step further and show that we can exchange the sum over k and the integral over $dq_1 \dots dq_n$. This is the content of the next lemma where we choose to work in the finite volume case, since we will need it in the sequel.

Lemma 4.3. *For any $n \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$ we have that*

$$P_{N,|\Lambda|}(n+k) \frac{1}{n!k!} \int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=1}^k dq_{n+j} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{n,n+k}^{AF}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right| \leq C \rho^n e^{-ck}, \quad (4.16)$$

for some positive constants c, C independent of k, N and Λ , with $N = \lfloor \rho|\Lambda| \rfloor$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. Recall the use of the shortcut $I \sim g$ for the multi-indices in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k})$, as in (4.8). Then, we can write the left hand side of (4.16) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{N(N-1) \dots (N-(n+k)+1)}{|\Lambda|^{n+k}} \frac{1}{n!k!} \int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=1}^k dq_{n+j} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \sum_{I \sim g}^* c_I \right| \\ &= \binom{N}{n+k} \binom{n+k}{n} \int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=1}^k dq_{n+j} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{n+k}} \left| \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k}) \\ A(I)=[n+k]}}^* c_I \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k} \\ g \sim I}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k}) \\ A(I)=[n+k]}}^* |c_I| \binom{N}{n+k} \binom{n+k}{n} \int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=1}^k dq_{n+j} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{n+k}} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k} \\ g \sim I}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right|, \quad (4.17) \end{aligned}$$

where the class $g \sim I$ consists of all graphs that can be constructed as follows: for each $V \in \text{supp } I$, choose a graph $g_V \in \mathcal{C}_V$ and g is obtained by gluing the graphs g_V and $g_{V'}$ at the unique intersection point $V \cap V'$. Let $V_0, V_1, \dots, V_r$ be the polymers in the support of a given I , i.e., with $I(V_i) > 0$, $i = 0, \dots, r$. Without loss of generality we suppose that V_0 is the (only) polymer that contains $A_0 := \{1, \dots, n\}$, the set of the labels corresponding to the white vertices. We can write:

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k} \\ g \sim I}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right| = \left| \sum_{g_0 \in \mathcal{C}_{V_0}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g_0)} f_{i,j} \right| \prod_{j=1}^r \left| \sum_{g_j \in \mathcal{C}_{V_j}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g_j)} f_{i,j} \right|,$$

as each of the polymers $V_1, \dots, V_r$ intersects with V_0 at most at one label. Alluding to the constraints (4.6) and (4.7) we split the integral as follows:

$$\int_{\Lambda^k} \prod_{j=1}^k dq_{n+j} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{n+k}} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{n,n+k} \\ g \sim I}} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^n} \prod_{j=0}^r \hat{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(V), \quad (4.18)$$

where, we have introduced the notation:

$$\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(V) := \begin{cases} \int_{\Lambda^{|V \setminus A_0|}} \frac{dq_{V \setminus A_0}}{|\Lambda|^{|V \setminus A_0|}} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right|, & \text{if } V \supset A_0, \\ \int_{\Lambda^{|V|}} \prod_{j \in V} \frac{dq_j}{|\Lambda|} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j} \right|, & \text{if } |V \cap A_0| \in \{0, 1\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that these activities differ from the ones in (3.5) by not having the test functions ϕ inside of the integral, but instead some fixed configurations $\underline{q}_{A_0}$ (which we indicate by the $\bullet$). Thus, we can bound (4.17) using (4.18) and the definition of the binomial coefficient:

$$\frac{\rho^n}{n!} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k}) \\ A(I)=[n+k]}}^* |c_I| \binom{N-n}{k} \prod_{j=0}^r |\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(V)| \leq \frac{\rho^n}{n!} \sum_{\substack{A \subset [N-n] \\ |A|=k}} \sum_{\substack{I: \\ A(I)=A \cup A_0}}^* |c_I| |\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet|^I. \quad (4.19)$$

Then, it is easy to show that the abstract polymer model in $\mathcal{V}_{n,N-n}$ (with n white labels and $N-n$ black) with compatibility condition $V \sim V'$ if and only if $V \cap V' = \emptyset$ and activities $\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet$, satisfies the hypothesis (3.8) of Theorem 3.1. To show it, for the case $V_0 \supset A_0$ we have:

$$\sup_{\underline{q}_{A_0} \in \Lambda^{|A_0|}} |\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(V_0)| \leq e^{2\beta B|V_0|} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{V_0}} \sup_{\underline{q}_{A_0} \in \Lambda^{|A_0|}} \int dq_{V_0 \setminus A_0} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(\tau)} |f_{i,j}|. \quad (4.20)$$

Considering one of the labels in A_0 as the root, we take the supremum of $f_{i,j}$ for any edge which has another label from A_0 as a vertex further away from the root. This will give a contribution of $\|f_{i,j}\|_\infty$ for each such edge. The remaining vertices give a contribution $C(\beta)$. Overall, we bound (4.20) by

$$\leq e^{2\beta B|V_0|} |\mathcal{T}_{|V_0|}| (\|f_{i,j}\|_\infty \vee C(\beta))^{|A_0|-1} C(\beta)^{|V_0|-|A_0|}, \quad (4.21)$$

where $s \vee t$ denotes the maximum of the two numbers s, t . Similarly, for the case $|V \cap A_0| \in \{0, 1\}$, we have:

$$|\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(V)| \leq |\mathcal{T}_{|V|}| (e^{2\beta B} C(\beta))^{|V|}. \quad (4.22)$$

With these bounds it is easy to show that (3.8) holds. Then, Theorem 3.1 can be applied obtaining an absolutely convergent series $\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,k})} c_I (\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet)^I$, equal to the logarithm of some abstract polymer model partition function, but which does not necessarily correspond to some correlation function due to the absolute value in (4). Thus, from (4.19), using (3.9), we obtain that

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,N-n}) \\ |A(I) \setminus A_0|=k}}^* |c_I| |\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet|^I \leq e^{-ck} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{n,N-n}) \\ |A(I) \setminus A_0|=k}}^* |c_I| |\hat{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet|^I e^{ck} \leq C e^{-ck}, \quad (4.23)$$

for some $C > 0$ as in (3.14), depending on n . $\square$

Since the bound (4.16) is uniform in the volume Λ , we can pass to the limit $\Lambda \uparrow \infty$ and prove (2.28), concluding the proof of Theorem 2.7. $\square$

5. DIRECT CORRELATION FUNCTION, PROOF OF THEOREM 2.9

Using (2.18), Theorem 2.7 and definition (2.23) the leading order of the second Ursell function can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Lambda^2} dq_1 dq_2 \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) u_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) = \\ \int_{\Lambda^2} dq_1 dq_2 \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) \sum_{k \geq 0} P_{N, |\Lambda|}(2+k) \frac{1}{2!k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2, 2+k}^{\text{AF}}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) + O\left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

In order to derive the Ornstein-Zernike equation in the canonical ensemble, we split the graphs in the right hand side of (5.1) at the nodal points (recall Definition 2.6). These are the points through which pass all paths joining q_1 to q_2 , hence we can order them. Given $g \in \mathcal{B}_{2, 2+k}^{\text{AF}}$, we choose the first nodal point starting from q_1 and call its label j . Note that by the definition of articulation points, $j \neq 1, 2$. Upon the removal of this point the graph g splits into two connected components: g_1 with $l+2$ vertices and g_2 with $k-l+1$ vertices with the only common vertex being the one with label j . Note that g_1 contains q_1 and g_2 contains q_2 . Since q_j is the location of a nodal point, we can write

$$\tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) = \int_{\Lambda} dq_j \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_1; q_1, q_j) \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_2; q_j, q_2).$$

Then, the leading term in (5.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Lambda^2} dq_1 dq_2 \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} P_{N, |\Lambda|}(2+k) \frac{1}{2!k!} \left[\sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2, k+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) + \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j=3}^{k+2} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{l} \int_{\Lambda} \frac{dq_j}{|\Lambda|} \sum_{g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_1; q_1, q_j) \sum_{g_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, k-l+1}^{\text{AF}}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_2; q_j, q_2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

We rewrite this in such a way that *direct two-point correlation function* (uniquely defined up to leading order) as given in (2.29) appear. By choosing the label $j = 3$ in (5.2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Lambda^2} dq_1 dq_2 \frac{1}{2} \phi(q_1) \phi(q_2) \left[\sum_{k=0}^{N-2} P_{N, |\Lambda|}(2+k) \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{2, k+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) + \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{k=0}^{N-2} P_{N, |\Lambda|}(2+k) \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_1; q_1, q_3) \frac{1}{(k-1-l)!} \sum_{g_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, k-l+1}^{\text{AF}}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_2; q_3, q_2) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By using new labels $l_1 := l$ and $l_2 := k-1-l$, the last summand can be rewritten as follows

$$\sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \frac{1}{l_1!} \sum_{g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l_1+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_1; q_1, q_3) \sum_{l_2=0}^{N-3-l_1} P_{N, |\Lambda|}(l_1+l_2+3) \frac{1}{l_2!} \sum_{g_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l_2+2}^{\text{AF}}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g_2; q_3, q_2). \quad (5.3)$$

Let us introduce the following shorthands

$$\bar{C}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_1 + 2; q_1, q_3) := \frac{1}{l_1!} \sum_{g_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l_1+2}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g_1; q_1, q_3) \quad (5.4)$$

and

$$\bar{B}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_2 + 2; q_3, q_2) := \frac{1}{l_2!} \sum_{g_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{2, l_2+2}^{\text{AF}}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g_2; q_3, q_2). \quad (5.5)$$

Then we can rewrite (5.3) as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Lambda dq_3 \quad & \sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1 + 1) \bar{C}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_1 + 2; q_1, q_3) \times \\ & \times \sum_{l_2=0}^{N-3-l_1} \frac{P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1 + l_2 + 3)}{P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1 + 1) P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2 + 2)} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2 + 2) \bar{B}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_2 + 2; q_3, q_2), \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

which is a finite volume version of the convolution term in OZ equation.

Proof of Theorem 2.9: The proof will be divided into two lemmas: the first proves the validity of the Ornstein-Zernike equation at finite volume (up to leading order) and the second the infinite volume convergence. As a consequence of (5.6) we have:

Lemma 5.1. *Under the hypothesis of the previous theorems, the function $c_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}$ defined in (2.29) fulfils the Ornstein-Zernike equation to leading order uniformly in q_1, q_2 :*

$$u_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) = \rho^2 c_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_2) + \int_\Lambda dq_3 \rho c_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_1, q_3) u_{\Lambda, N}^{(2)}(q_3, q_2) + O\left(\frac{1}{|\Lambda|}\right). \quad (5.7)$$

Proof. Using the estimates (3.27) and (3.28) in [33], namely that for some constant c' it holds that for all l and N

$$\left| \frac{P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l)}{\rho^l} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{c'}{|\Lambda|}, \quad (5.8)$$

we can replace in (5.6) all terms of the form $P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l)$ by powers of ρ up to an error of order $O(1/|\Lambda|)$. Applying that to the fraction $\frac{P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+l_2+3)}{P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1)P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2)}$ we replace (5.6) by:

$$\int_\Lambda dq_3 \sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1 + 1) \bar{C}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_1 + 2; q_1, q_3) \sum_{l_2=0}^{N-3-l_1} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2 + 2) \bar{B}_\Lambda^\bullet(2, l_2 + 2; q_3, q_2). \quad (5.9)$$

We write the Ornstein-Zernike equation plus terms of lower order in $|\Lambda|$. Then (5.9) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) \bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_3) \sum_{l_2=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2) \bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_2+2; q_3, q_2) \\ & - \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) \bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_3) \sum_{l_2=N-3-l_1}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2) \bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_2+2; q_3, q_2). \end{aligned}$$

We show that the second term is of order $O(1/|\Lambda|)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \sum_{l_1=0}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) \bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_3) \sum_{l_2=N-3-l_1}^{N-3} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2) \bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_2+2; q_3, q_2) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{q'_3} \sum_{l_2=\lceil N/2 \rceil - 2}^{\infty} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2) |\bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_2+2; q'_3, q_2)| \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \sum_{l_1=0}^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) |\bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_3)| \\ & + \sup_{q'_3} \sum_{l_2=0}^{\infty} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_2+2) |\bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_2+2; q'_3, q_2)| \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 \sum_{l_1=\lceil N/2 \rceil}^{\infty} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) |\bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_3)|. \end{aligned}$$

The above bound is of order $O(1/|\Lambda|)$ as both summands contain the following factors which are tails of the corresponding convergent series, obtaining that

$$\sup_{q_2, q_3} \sum_{l=N+1}^{\infty} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l+2) |\bar{B}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l+2; q_3, q_2)| \leq C e^{-cn} \quad (5.10)$$

and

$$\sup_{q_1} \sum_{l=N+1}^{\infty} P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l+1) \int_{\Lambda} dq_3 |\bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l+2; q_1, q_3)| \leq C e^{-cn}, \quad (5.11)$$

for some constants $C, c > 0$. The first follows from the bound in (4.16), while the second is a consequence of the next lemma. $\square$

The second result is about the convergence and integrability of $c_N^{(2)}(q_1, q_2)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In order to take the limit in (5.7) and get the infinite volume version of the OZ equation, we need to check (2.31) which is given in the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *For some positive constants C and c independent of N and Λ and for every $l_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q_1 \in \Lambda$ we have that*

$$P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1+1) \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 |\bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1+2; q_1, q_2)| \leq C \rho e^{-cl_1}, \quad (5.12)$$

for Λ large enough.

Remark 5.3. *It is important for the above estimate to hold, that we have an integral in q_2 , that is an integral over the variable corresponding to the second white vertex. For short we call it the integrated white vertex.*

Proof. The proof follows the line of calculation in Lemma 4.3. The main difference is that here we do not require that there exists a polymer V_0 containing both white vertices. Hence we restrict to the class

$$I(V) = 1, \forall V \in \text{supp } I, \text{ and} \quad (5.13)$$

$$m + k = \sum_{V \in \text{supp } I} (|V| - 1) + 1 \quad (5.14)$$

and we denote it by using the superscript $**$ over the sum, in order to distinguish it from the previous case. Recalling again the shortcut $I \sim g$ for the class of multi-indices in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,l_1})$ as in (4.8), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{N,|\Lambda|}(l_1 + 1) \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \bar{C}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(2, l_1 + 2; q_1, q_2) \right| = \\ &= \frac{N(N-1) \dots (N - (l_1 + 1) + 1)}{|\Lambda|^{l_1+1}} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \frac{1}{l_1!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{2,2+l_1}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) \sum_{I \sim g}^{**} c_I \right| \\ &= \frac{N}{|\Lambda|} \binom{N-1}{l_1} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,l_1}) \\ A(I)=[l_1+2]}}^{**} c_I \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{l_1}} \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{2,2+l_1} \\ g \sim I}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

where in the last sum over multi-indices in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,l_1})$, the class $\mathcal{V}_{2,l_1}$ consists of all subsets of the labels corresponding to the white vertices $\{1, 2\}$ and the black vertices $\{3, \dots, l_1 + 2\}$. The class $g \sim I$ is as before in (4.17). The compatibility graph of the polymers is a connected graph whose blocks are complete graphs (usually called Husimi graphs, see [22, 13]). Within this structure we denote by $V_1, \dots, V_r$ the chain of pairwise incompatible polymers such that the label $1 \in V_1$ and the label $2 \in V_r$. Note that r could be equal to 1, but in this case the structure would be exactly as in the previous theorem. We denote by i_j the common label of V_j and V_{j+1} , $j = 1, \dots, r-1$ and by V'_s , for s from an index set S , the remaining polymers attached to the rest of the structure by the label i_s . Note that by translation invariance the activity associated to V'_s does not depend on the label that connects it to the chain. Hence we can write (letting $x_{i_0} := q_1$ and $x_{i_r} := q_2$)

$$\sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{2,2+l_1} \\ g \sim I}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) = \int_{\Lambda^{r-1}} \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} dx_{i_j} \prod_{j=1}^r \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{V_j}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; x_{i_{j-1}}, x_{i_j}) \prod_{s \in S} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{V_s}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; x_{i_s}). \quad (5.16)$$

Notice that this expression does not factorise like in the previous case for the reason that the two white vertices are not in the same polymer. It is exactly here that the extra integral

over dq_2 is helpful. By integrating over the common labels i_j , $j = 1, \dots, r-1$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \sum_{\substack{g \in \mathcal{C}_{2,2+l_1}: \\ g \sim I}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) \right| \\ & \leq \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \int_{\Lambda^{r-1}} \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} dx_{i_j} \prod_{j=1}^r \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{V_j}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; x_{i_{j-1}}, x_{i_j}) \right| \prod_{s \in S} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{V_s}} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; x_{i_s}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Transforming to the difference variables $x_{i_j} - x_{i_{j-1}}$ we see that the integrals in the chain factorize as well. Then, by introducing the notation

$$\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(V) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|\mathcal{V}|-2}} \sup_{q_1 \in \Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1, q_2) \right|, & \text{if } V \supset \{q_1, q_2\}, \\ \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|\mathcal{V}|-1}} \int_{\Lambda} dq_2 \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_2) \right|, & \text{if } V \ni q_2, V \cap \{q_1\} = \emptyset \\ \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|\mathcal{V}|-1}} \sup_{q_1 \in \Lambda} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; q_1) \right|, & \text{if } V \ni q_1, V \cap \{q_2\} = \emptyset \\ \frac{1}{|\Lambda|^{|\mathcal{V}|}} \left| \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_V} \tilde{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(g; \emptyset) \right|, & \text{if } V \cap \{q_1, q_2\} = \emptyset, \end{cases} \quad (5.17)$$

we obtain the following upper bound for (5.15):

$$\rho \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,l_1}) \\ A(I)=[l_1+2]}}^* |c_I| \binom{N-1}{l_1} \prod_{V \in \text{supp } I} |\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(V)| = \rho \sum_{\substack{A \subset [N-1] \\ |A|=l_1}} \sum_{\substack{I: A(I)=A \cup \{1,2\}}}^* |c_I| \prod_{V \in \text{supp } I} |\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}(V)|. \quad (5.18)$$

Then, it is easy to show that the abstract polymer model in $\mathcal{V}_{2,N-2}$ (with 2 white labels and $N-2$ black) and activities $\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}$ satisfies the hypothesis (3.8) of Theorem 3.1 (by obtaining similar bounds as previously). Thus, from (5.18), using (3.9), we obtain that

$$\sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,N-2}) \\ |A(I) \setminus \{1,2\}|=l_1}}^* |c_I| |\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}|^I \leq e^{-cl_1} \sum_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{V}_{2,N-2}) \\ |A(I) \setminus \{1,2\}|=l_1}}^* |c_I| |\bar{\zeta}_{\Lambda}^{\bullet}|^I e^{cl_1} \leq C e^{-cl_1}, \quad (5.19)$$

for some $C > 0$ as in (3.14). □

With this we conclude the proof of Theorem 2.9 as well. □

6. TOWARDS A COMBINATORIAL INTERPRETATION

Until recently, it was customary to investigate the density expansions of thermodynamic quantities in the context of the grand-canonical ensemble. This was because the lack of the canonical constraint (i.e., having a fixed number of particles) allowed for special resummations. As a result, the representation of coefficients is given by classes of graphs whose different connectivity properties are related to combinatorial identities, see [37] for more details. For example, for the conjugate pair of free energy and pressure this is the well known dissymmetry theorem, see e.g. Theorem 3.7 in [22]. The correlation functions $h^{(n)}$ for $n \geq 2$ actually correspond to an easier structure than in the case $n = 1$. Let us

consider the case $n = 2$ and the expansion of $\rho^{(2)}$ in terms of the activity. Upon the removal of one white vertex the graph decomposes into connected components which either contain the other white vertex or not. Collecting those not containing a white vertex, we reconstruct the expansion of $\rho^{(1)}$ in terms of the activity. One repeats the same procedure for the other white vertex. The remaining graph has the property that both white vertices are contained in exactly one articulation point free block. Considering the associated block-articulation point graph, the parts that do not correspond to the special block containing the white vertices, exactly reconstruct the $\rho^{(1)}$ -expansion at each black vertex of the special block. One can argue similarly for all $n \geq 2$, cf. Section 5 in [37]. Using the combinatorial language as for example in [22], this is just the following combinatorial identity interpreted as formal power series:

$$\mathcal{C}_n^* = (\mathcal{C}^\bullet)^n \mathcal{B}_n^{\text{AF}}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet), \quad (6.1)$$

where $\mathcal{C}_n^*$, $\mathcal{B}_n^{\text{AF}}$ respectively, denotes the set of connected, articulation point free respectively, graphs with n special vertices. $\mathcal{C}^\bullet$ denotes the set of graphs with one special vertex, but multiplied with the activity.

The case $n = 1$ has a more difficult structure. Let us derive it in more detail

$$\frac{\rho_\Lambda^{(1)}(q_1)}{z} = \frac{1}{\Xi_\Lambda(z)} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{z^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \int_{\Lambda^{n-1}} dq_2 \dots dq_n e^{-\beta H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q})}, \quad (6.2)$$

where z is the activity and $\Xi_\Lambda(z)$ the grand-canonical partition function. Writing $-\beta H_\Lambda(\mathbf{q}) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}_n} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E(g)} f_{i,j}$, we split the graph and the integral over the connected components of each graph. Recalling the definition of the activity $\tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1, \dots, q_n)$ given in (2.23), we get that (6.2) equals to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\Xi_\Lambda(z)} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{(P_0, \dots, P_k) \in \Pi(2, \dots, n)} \left(z^{|P_0|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}(P_0 \cup \{1\})} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) \right) \prod_{j=1}^k \left(z^{|P_j|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}(P_j)} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 1} n z^{n-1} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_n} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{z^{n-1}}{n!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{1,n}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1), \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where 1 is a special point. Upon the removal of the white vertex, the remaining graph splits into connected components $P_1, \dots, P_k$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_1(P)$ the set of all graphs in $P \cup \{1\}$ which have 1 as a special vertex and are still connected even on its removal. In other words,

1 is not an articulation circle in the sense of Stell. Then, from (6.2), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\rho_\Lambda^{(1)}(q_1)}{z} &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{(P_1, \dots, P_k) \in \Pi(1, \dots, n)} \prod_{j=1}^k \left(z^{|P_j|} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_1(P_j)} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) \right) \\
&= 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{k!} \left(\sum_{p \geq 1} \frac{z^p}{p!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_{1,p+1}} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) \right)^k \\
&= \exp \left\{ \sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_1^*} \frac{z^{|g|}}{|g|!} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) \right\}, \tag{6.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last sum we denote by $\mathcal{C}_1^*$ the set of connected graphs with 1 as a special vertex and any cardinality. At this point we are able, as described in the case $n \geq 2$ before, to systematically replace the black z vertices by black $\rho_\Lambda^{(1)}$ vertices and thus obtain that

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{C}_1^*} \frac{z^{|g|}}{|g|!} \tilde{\zeta}_\Lambda^\bullet(g; q_1) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \beta_{\Lambda, m} (\rho_\Lambda^{(1)}(q_1))^m = F'_\Lambda(\rho_\Lambda^{(1)}(q_1)), \tag{6.5}$$

recalling that

$$\beta_{\Lambda, m} := \frac{1}{m!} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{B}_{1, m+1}} \int_{\Lambda^m} \prod_{\{i, j\} \in E(g)} (e^{-\beta V(q_i - q_j)} - 1) dq_2 \dots dq_{m+1}, \quad q_1 \text{ fixed}, \tag{6.6}$$

is the virial coefficient and $F_\Lambda(\rho) := \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m+1} \beta_{\Lambda, m} \rho^{m+1}$.

This is exactly the combinatorial identity given in [22], Theorem 1.1. The above calculation is also one of the motivations to define (following [37]):

$$h^{(1)}(q_1) := \log(\rho(q_1)) - \log(z) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \beta_m(\rho(q_1))^m, \tag{6.7}$$

in the thermodynamic limit. Note that because of translation invariance both $h^{(1)}(q_1)$ and $\rho(q_1)$ are constant. This is also closely related to the Legendre transform giving the equivalence of ensembles between pressure and free energy at the thermodynamic limit:

$$p(z) = \sup_{\rho} \{\rho \log z - f(\rho)\}, \quad f(\rho) = \sup_z \{\rho \log z - p(z)\}.$$

In the first case the sup is attained at $\log z = f'(\rho)$ and hence

$$h^{(1)} = \log \rho - f'(\rho) = F'(\rho), \tag{6.8}$$

where $F(\rho) = \rho(\log \rho - 1) - f(\rho)$ is the free energy corresponding to the “interaction” between the particles.

We conclude this section by noting that the OZ equation corresponds to the following easy combinatorial fact. For the second correlation functions the expansion in the density is given by the sum over all graphs free of articulation vertices. Hence the block graph associated

to such a graph is actually a chain connecting the two white vertices. The OZ equation is nothing than an iterative representation of this fact.

7. APPLICATIONS TO LIQUID STATE THEORY

The rigorous expansions that we present in this paper can serve as a tool for quantifying the error in existing theories which are extensively used in the liquid state, as well as for suggesting systematic error-improving schemes. We give here a first glimpse of this. To start, we recall that the Ornstein-Zernike equation (2.16) is not a closed equation as it involves both correlation functions $h^{(2)}(q_1, q_2)$ and $c(q_1, q_2)$. One suggestion for a closure is the Percus-Yevick (PY) equation [31] that we describe below. Starting from the OZ equation for $h^{(2)}(r)$ and $c(r)$, following [38], one first introduces a new function t as follows:

$$t(r) := c * h^{(2)}(r), \quad (7.1)$$

where we use the convolution: $c * h^{(2)}(r) := \rho \int c(r') h^{(2)}(r - r') dr'$. Then the OZ equation takes the form

$$h^{(2)}(r) = c(r) + t(r). \quad (7.2)$$

Note that all involved functions ($h^{(2)}$, c and t) are analytic functions in ρ . Furthermore, $c(r)$ can be written as

$$c(r) = f(r)(1 + t(r)) + m(r), \quad (7.3)$$

where $f(r) := e^{-\beta V(r)} - 1$ is a known function of the potential $V(r)$. The relation (7.3) is essentially the definition of $m(r)$ which is an analytic function of ρ as well. Following [38] the function m can be expressed as a sum over two connected graphs which upon removal of the direct link f (if it is present) between the white vertices it is two-connected (no articulation and no nodal points). For example, the first term of $m(r)$ is the graph $1 - 3 - 2 - 4 - 1$. However, in [38], “*the manipulations involved in obtaining these infinite sums ... have been carried out in a purely formal way and we have not examined the important but difficult questions of convergence and the legitimacy of the rearrangement of terms*”. The present paper establishes this convergence with respect to f -bonds. The convergence allows to quantify the error after truncating these terms. For example, m is of order ρ^2 . Furthermore, a future plan is to investigate whether another suggestion could be made, relating some of the terms in $m(r)$ with respect to $t(r)$, or by introducing another function (instead of $t(r)$) as a candidate for a good choice for “closing” OZ equation. Combining (7.1) with (7.2) and (7.3) we obtain:

$$t = [f(1 + t) + m] * [f(1 + t) + m] + [f(1 + t) + m] * t. \quad (7.4)$$

One version of PY equation is setting $m(r) \equiv 0$ and obtaining a closed equation for $t(r)$. Alternatively, using (7.2) and (7.3) one can introduce the functions $y(r)$ and $d(r)$ by

$$g^{(2)}(r) = e^{-\beta V(r)} t(r) + m(r) =: e^{-\beta V(r)} y(r), \quad y(r) =: 1 + t(r) + d(r), \quad (7.5)$$

and hence $m(r) = e^{-\beta V} d(r)$. Thus, we can rewrite (7.4) as

$$y = 1 + d + [f y + d] * [e^{-\beta V} y - 1], \quad (7.6)$$

noting that $m(r) = e^{-\beta V(r)}d(r)$. Again, setting $d(r) \equiv 0$ we obtain another version of PY equation. All objects are analytical in ρ and our results imply that the formal order in ρ of d coincides with the actual order. Now, one can investigate a method of systematically improving the PY equation, by adding some terms from d (or from m for hard-core potentials). For example, in [38] it was suggested to set d equal to the first order term in its expansion, since this gives a “*PY approximation that it leads to an approximate g that is exact through terms of order ρ^2 in its virial expansion*”.

Other closures include the *Hypernetted Chain* (HNC) equation, the Born-Green-Yvon (BGY) hierarchy and many others for which we could investigate the validity of the corresponding graphical expansions. We conclude by mentioning that another direction that has attracted considerable interest is the construction of exact solutions of the PY equation, which however usually cannot be expressed as truncations of convergent series. But still, several suggestions have been made for models of rigid spheres; see [8] and the references therein for a comparison of the different methods.

Acknowledgments. We acknowledge support from the London Mathematical Society via a research in pairs Scheme 4 grant.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. N. Bogoliubov, Problems of a Dynamical Theory in Statistical Physics, in Russian, English translation in J. de Boer and G. E. Uhlenbeck, editors, *Studies in Statistical Mechanics*, volume 1, pages 1-118, Amsterdam, 1962. North-Holland
- [2] N. N. Bogolyubov, B. I. Hacet, On some mathematical problems of the theory of statistical equilibrium, *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR (N.S.)* **66** (1949), pp. 321–324.
- [3] N. N. Bogolyubov, D.Y. A. Petrina, B.I. Hacet, Mathematical description of the equilibrium state of classical systems on the basis of the canonical ensemble formalism, translated from *Teoret. Mat. Fiz.* **1** (1969), no. 2, pp. 251–274.
- [4] M. Born, H. S. Green, A general kinetic theory of liquids. I. The molecular distribution functions, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **188** (1946), 10.
- [5] A. Bovier, M. Zahradník, A simple inductive approach to the problem of convergence of cluster expansion in polymer models, *J. Stat. Phys.* **100** (2000), pp. 765–777.
- [6] D. C. Brydges, A short course on cluster expansions, in *Phénomènes critiques, systèmes aléatoires, théories de jauge*, Les Houches (1984), Elsevier/North Holland, Amsterdam (1986), 129–183.
- [7] M. Campanino, D. Ioffe, Y. Velenik, Ornstein-Zernike theory for finite range Ising models above T_c , *Prob. Th. Rel. Fields* **125** (2003), no. 3, pp. 305–349.
- [8] N. F. Carnahan, K. E. Starling, Equation of state for nonattracting rigid spheres, *J. Chem. Phys.* **51** (1969), no. 2, 635–636.
- [9] C. De Dominicis, Variational formulations of equilibrium statistical mechanics, *J. Math. Phys.* **3** (1962), no. 5, pp. 983–1002.
- [10] R. Fernandez, A. Procacci, Cluster expansion for abstract polymer models. New bounds from an old approach, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **274** (2007), pp. 123–140.
- [11] M. Fischer, J. Lebowitz, Asymptotic free energy of a system with periodic boundary conditions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **19** (1970), 251–272.
- [12] T. L. Hill, *Statistical Mechanics*, McGraw-Hill, New-York, 1956.
- [13] K. Husimi, Note on Mayer’s theory of cluster integrals, *J. Chem. Phys.* **18** (1950), pp. 682–684.

- [14] S. Jansen, S. J. Tate, D. Tsagkarogiannis, D. Ueltschi, Multispecies virial expansions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **330** (2014), no. 2, pp. 801–817.
- [15] M. Katsoulakis, P. Plecháč, L. Rey-Bellet, D. Tsagkarogiannis, Coarse-graining schemes and a posteriori error estimates for stochastic lattice systems, *ESAIM: Math. Model. and Num. Analysis* **41** (2007), no. 3, pp. 627–660.
- [16] J. Kirkwood, Molecular distribution in liquids, *J. Chem. Phys.* **7** (1939), p. 919.
- [17] J. Kirkwood, Z. W. Salsburg, Discuss. Faraday Soc. **15** (1953), p. 28.
- [18] R. Kotecký, D. Preiss, Cluster expansion for abstract polymer models, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **103** (1986), pp. 491–498.
- [19] T. Kuna, J. Lebowitz, E. Speer, Realizability of point processes, *J. Stat. Phys.* **129** (2007), pp. 417–439.
- [20] J. L. Lebowitz, O. Penrose, Convergence of virial expansions, *J. Math. Phys.* **5** (1964), no. 7, pp. 841–847.
- [21] G. Last, S. Ziesche, On the Ornstein-Zernike equation and analyticity of cluster-functional in the random connection model of percolation, *preprint* 2016.
- [22] P. Leroux, Enumerative problems inspired by Mayer’s theory of cluster integrals, *Electron. J. Combin.* **11** (2004), no. 1.
- [23] J. E. Mayer, M. G. Mayer, *Statistical Mechanics*, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1940.
- [24] J. E. Mayer, E. Montroll, Molecular distribution, *J. Chem. Phys.* **9** (1941), 2.
- [25] T. Morais, A. Procacci, Continuous particles in the canonical ensemble as an abstract polymer gas, *J. Stat. Phys.* **157** (2014), pp. 17–39.
- [26] T. Morita, K. Hiroike, A new Approach to the Theory of Classical Fluids, I, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **23** (1960), no. 6, p. 1003.
- [27] T. Morita, K. Hiroike, A new Approach to the Theory of Classical Fluids, III, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **25** (1961), no. 4, p. 537.
- [28] F. R. Nardi, E. Olivieri, M. Zahradnik, On the Ising model with strongly anisotropic external field, *J. Stat. Phys.* **97** (1999), pp. 87–145.
- [29] L. S. Ornstein, F. Zernike, Accidental deviations of density and opalescence at the critical point of a single substance, *Proc. Akad. Sci. (Amsterdam)* **17** (1914).
- [30] O. Penrose, *Convergence of fugacity expansions for classical systems*, Bak, A. (ed.) Statistical Mechanics: Foundations and Applications (1967), Benjamin, New York.
- [31] J. K. Percus, G. J. Yevick, Analysis of classical Statistical Mechanics by Means of Collective Coordinates, *Phys. Rev.* **110** (1958), no. 1.
- [32] S. Poghossyan, D. Ueltschi, Abstract cluster expansion with applications to statistical mechanical systems, *J. Math. Phys.* **50** (2009), 053509.
- [33] E. Pulvirenti, D. Tsagkarogiannis, Cluster expansion in the canonical ensemble, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **316** (2012), no. 2, pp. 289–306.
- [34] E. Pulvirenti, D. Tsagkarogiannis, Finite volume corrections and decay of correlations in the Canonical Ensemble, *J. Stat. Phys.* **159** (2015), no. 5, pp. 1017–1039.
- [35] D. Ruelle, *Statistical Mechanics: rigorous results*, World Scientific, Imperial College Press, 1969.
- [36] D. Ruelle, Correlation functions of classical gases, *Ann. Phys.* **25** (1963), pp. 109–120.
- [37] G. Stell, Cluster expansion for classical systems in equilibrium, in H. Frisch and J. Lebowitz, ed., *Classical Fluids* (New York: Benjamin, 1964).
- [38] G. Stell, The Percus-Yevick equation for the radial distribution function of a fluid, *Physica* **29** (1963), pp. 517–534.
- [39] S. Torquato, G. Stell, Microstructure of two-phase random media. II. The Mayer-Montroll and Kirkwood-Salsburg hierarchies, *J. Chem. Phys.* **78** (1983), p. 3262.
- [40] G. E. Uhlenbeck, G. W. Ford, *Lectures in Statistical Mechanics*. Providence RI: Amer. Math. Soc., 1963.

- [41] J. Yvon, Théorie statistique des fluides et l'équation d'état, *Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles*, no. 203, Hermann & Cie, Paris, 1935.

TOBIAS KUNA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF READING, READING RG6 6AX, UK

E-mail address: t.kuna@reading.ac.uk

DIMITRIOS TSAGKAROGIANNIS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX, BRIGHTON BN1 9QH, UK

E-mail address: D.Tsagkarogiannis@sussex.ac.uk